

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on July 23, 2010, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 8-21 and 23-26 are pending in the Application, where claim 22 has been currently canceled without prejudice, and claims 23-26 have been currently added. Claims 1, 11 and 16 are independent.

By means of the present amendment, the specification has been amended for better clarity.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 3, 8-10, 12, 14-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0079512 (Yamazaki) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0020939 (Ikeda) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0079653 (Hamon). Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Ikeda, Hamon and U.S. Patent No. 5,610,629 (Baur). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Ikeda, Hamon and U.S. Patent No. 6,429,857 (Masters). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Ikeda, Hamon and U.S. Patent No. 5,742,279 (Yamamoto). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Ikeda and U.S. Patent

Application Publication No. 2004/0117735 (Breen). Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Ikeda, Hamon and WO 00/75766 (Macinnes). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Yamazaki in view of Ikeda, Hamon, Masters and Baur. Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that claims 1-5, 8-21 and 23-26 are patentable over Yamazaki, Ikeda, Hamon, Baur, Masters, Yamamoto, Breen, and Macinnes for at least the following reasons.

As correctly noted on page 3, last paragraph of the Final Office Action, Yamazaki and Ikeda do not disclose or suggest moving the at least part of the visual information from obscured parts of the display to the unobscured parts. Hamon is cited in an attempt to remedy the deficiencies in Yamazaki and Ikeda.

Hamon is directed to a display having a detector to detect the presence of a device that obscures at least part of the viewable area of the display, and a display control element to modify the viewable area when the presence of such a device is detected, as recited in the Abstract. As clearly shown in FIGs 4-5, when a keyboard 17 is placed on the screen 12, the displayed content is re-sized to fit the smaller presentation area of the screen 12, namely, to by reducing the size of the displayed content.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 11 and claim 16, amongst other patentable elements recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the apparatus is configured to sense one or more objects when placed upon or positioned in proximity to the display and obscuring

at least part of the visual information displayed on the display, and to adapt the visual information for display on unobscured parts of the display which are unobscured by the one or more objects by moving the at least part of the visual information from obscured parts of the display to the unobscured parts of the display for displaying substantially all the visual information on the unobscured parts **without changing a size** of the visual information displayed on the display.

moving information from obscured parts of the display to the unobscured parts of the display without changing a size of the visual information displayed on the display is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Yamazaki, Ikeda, Hamon, and combination thereof. Baur, Masters, Yamamoto, Breen, and Macinnes are cited to allegedly show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Yamazaki, Ikeda and Hamon.


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 11 and 16 are allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5, 8-10, 12-15, 17-21 and 23-26 are also allowable at least based on their dependence from amended independent claims 1, and 16 as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived

and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
September 22, 2010

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**

111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101